

Remarks

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Office Action mailed July 30, 2003.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's phone call regarding the drawing objection and the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejections. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive to the above Office Action.

In the above Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings based on 37 CFR 1.84 (u)(1). Claims 39, 41, 43, 54, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to the drawing objection, the examiner objected to the drawings because the word "Figure" had been used rather than the abbreviation "Fig.", as shown in the "Brief Description of the Drawings" section of the specification. A drawing amendment has been submitted concurrent with this request for reconsideration. In the amendment, the word "Fig." is used to before each drawing number.

With regard to claims 39 and 54, claims 39 and 54 have been amended as suggested by the examiner to properly recite the Markush group.

With regard to claims 41, and 57, in the Office Action the examiner stated that the limitation "said contact layers having an expansion coefficient over an operating temperature range that is substantially the same as the coefficient of said filter elements" in

lines 3-5 and lines 1-3 respectively may be unclear. The examiner indicated that, for the purpose of examination, the examiner assumed the limitation to mean that the expansion coefficient of the contact layer is the same as the expansion coefficient of both the first and second filter elements. The applicant agrees with the examiner's interpretation. Claims 41 and 57 have been amended as required.

With regard to claim 43, in the Office Action the examiner stated that the limitation "wherein said contact layers are comprised of the same ceramic material as said filter elements" may be unclear. The examiner indicated that, for the purpose of examination, the examiner assumed the limitation to mean that the contact layer comprises the same ceramic material as both the first and second filter elements. The applicant agrees with this interpretation. Claim 43 has been amended as required.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments resolve all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that additional discussion would advance the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees to deposit account no. 50-0548.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Joseph W. Berenato, III
Reg. No. 30,546

Liniak, Berenato & White, LLC
Suite 240
6550 Rock Spring Dr.
Bethesda, MD 20817
Tele. (301) 896-0600